

## Bi-directional route learning in wood ants

Article (Unspecified)

Graham, P. and Collett, T. S. (2006) Bi-directional route learning in wood ants. *Journal of Experimental Biology*, 209 (18). pp. 3677-3684. ISSN 0022-0949

This version is available from Sussex Research Online: <http://sro.sussex.ac.uk/id/eprint/588/>

This document is made available in accordance with publisher policies and may differ from the published version or from the version of record. If you wish to cite this item you are advised to consult the publisher's version. Please see the URL above for details on accessing the published version.

### **Copyright and reuse:**

Sussex Research Online is a digital repository of the research output of the University.

Copyright and all moral rights to the version of the paper presented here belong to the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. To the extent reasonable and practicable, the material made available in SRO has been checked for eligibility before being made available.

Copies of full text items generally can be reproduced, displayed or performed and given to third parties in any format or medium for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

1 **Bi-directional route learning in wood ants**

2 Paul Graham and Thomas S. Collett

3 School of Life Sciences, University of Sussex, Brighton, BN1 9QG, UK.

4 T.S.Collett@Sussex.ac.uk

5 *Abstract*

6 **Some ants and bees readily learn visually guided routes between their nests and**  
7 **feeding sites. They can learn the appearance of visual landmarks for the food-**  
8 **bound or homeward segment of the route when these landmarks are only present**  
9 **during that particular segment of their round trip. We show here that wood ants**  
10 **can also acquire landmark information for guiding their homeward path while**  
11 **running their food-bound path, and that this information may be picked up,**  
12 **when ants briefly reverse direction and retrace their steps for a short distance.**  
13 **These short periods of looking back tend to occur early in route acquisition and**  
14 **are more frequent on homeward than on food-bound segments.**

15

16 **Introduction**

17 A number of species of ants are known to learn and follow visually guided routes  
18 when foraging. Part of the evidence for learnt, visually guided routes comes from the  
19 findings that over several trips an individual ant will follow much the same route  
20 through a visually cluttered environment and that different individuals from the same  
21 nest travelling to the same destination will follow their own idiosyncratic routes  
22 through the same surroundings (Collett et al., 1992a; Kohler and Wehner, 2005;  
23 Macquart et al., 2005; Wehner et al., 1996). Furthermore, ants will follow the same  
24 route irrespective of the state of their path integration system (Andel and Wehner,  
25 2003; Kohler and Wehner, 2005; Wehner et al., 1996) and when displaced to a point  
26 midway along the route they immediately join the route and continue it to its end

1 (Kohler and Wehner, 2005). A different kind of evidence for visual route guidance  
2 comes from observing how an acquired route depends on the distribution of visual  
3 features within an ant's environment (Graham et al., 2003) and how displacing,  
4 changing or removing visual landmarks after a route has been acquired influences an  
5 individual's path (Collett et al., 1998; Collett et al., 2001; Collett et al., 1992b;  
6 Graham and Collett, 2002; Macquart et al., 2005).

7

8 Visually guided food-ward and homeward routes can be very similar (Santschi, 1913),  
9 but they can also differ (Kohler and Wehner, 2005; Macquart et al., 2005; Wehner et  
10 al., 1983); see Fig 7 B and C, in Wehner 2003,). In either case, ants travelling in the  
11 two directions, between their nest and food or their food and nest, encounter and learn  
12 different sequence of views and associate different actions with those views. When  
13 there is a distinct spatial separation between food-ward and homeward routes (e.g.  
14 Wehner et al., in press), visual information pertaining to the food-ward or homeward  
15 route must be acquired while performing that route. When the two routes are similar  
16 the question arises as to whether ants might acquire landmark information to guide  
17 their homeward route on their food-ward route and vice-versa. Such cross-route  
18 learning would help make food-ward and homeward routes more similar, which  
19 would be useful in some environments, and might speed up route learning. It would  
20 also enhance the opportunity for communication between ants travelling in opposite  
21 directions. One might expect cross-route learning to be particularly prevalent in ant  
22 species that are guided by a combination of chemical and visual cues and so may tend  
23 to follow the same path in both directions.

24

1 In this paper we ask whether information for guiding a wood ant's homeward route  
2 can be acquired on the ant's outward route. We test first whether wood ants do learn  
3 a part of their homeward route while running a food-bound route. The basic  
4 experimental design was to give ants ample experience of a food-bound route, but to  
5 prevent any experience of a homeward route. We then examined whether these ants  
6 that were only used to travelling in one direction could perform elements of a  
7 homeward route with no help from path integration.

8

9 In the second part of the paper, we examine the way that food-bound and homeward  
10 routes develop by recording the successive food-bound and homeward trips  
11 performed by individual ants. Is there a close similarity in the evolution and final form  
12 of an individual's food-bound and homeward routes? To test whether running a  
13 homeward route facilitates acquisition of a food-bound route, we compared the  
14 developing food-bound routes of ants that were and were not allowed to run their  
15 homeward routes.

16

17 Navigational learning in insects is to a large degree anticipatory in the sense that  
18 insects learning a visually guided route are programmed to acquire relevant visual  
19 information at particular points along the route. The best understood behavioural  
20 routines aiding acquisition are the elaborately structured learning flights that bees  
21 (Lehrer, 1993) and wasps (Collett and Lehrer, 1993; Tinbergen, 1932; Zeil, 1993)  
22 perform when they first leave a significant place to which they will return, such as  
23 their nest or a newly discovered feeding site. The probable function of these localised  
24 flights is to allow an insect to pick up appropriate information that can guide its later  
25 return to the place. A failure to execute a learning flight can lead to difficulties when

1 the insect tries to find that goal on its return (Lehrer, 1993; Wagner, 1907). Wood  
2 ants, too, have been found to look back and approach nearby landmarks after they  
3 have found a new source of food (Nicholson et al., 1999; Rosengren, 1971). Desert  
4 ants behave similarly when first leaving their nest (Wehner et al., 2004). But little is  
5 known about whether and where such information is acquired along a route.

6

7 In the third section of the paper, we analyse the wood ant's food-bound and  
8 homeward routes to identify where information for guiding the opposite paths might  
9 be acquired. Because the landscape will generally look different in the two directions,  
10 ants are likely to learn landscape features for guiding their path in the reverse  
11 direction at times when they have turned around and are retracing their steps. If such  
12 potential points of acquisition do occur, how are they distributed along the ants'  
13 paths? Large landmarks act as beacons and seem to form intermediate goals that sub-  
14 divide a route (for bees: von Frisch, 1967 ; wood ants: Graham et al, 2003 ), so that an  
15 interesting possibility is that turn backs are particularly common close to a landmark  
16 that serves as an intermediate goal. A second question to be examined is whether turn-  
17 backs occur mostly in early routes when ants are still inexperienced.

18

## 19 **Materials and methods**

### 20 *The ants*

21 Colonies of wood ants (*Formica rufa*, L.) were maintained in the laboratory using  
22 methods already described (Graham et al., 2003). To select ants for training, a group  
23 of potential foragers was taken from the nest and placed at the start of the route. The  
24 first twenty or so ants to reach the food site were caught and then marked individually

1 with two dots of enamel paint. These ants comprised an experimental group. Usually,  
2 about two-thirds of the group foraged consistently and could be trained.

#### 4 *The arena*

5 Two experiments were conducted within low-walled rectangular arenas (e.g. Fig. 1a)  
6 the floors of which were covered with large (A0) sheets of white paper that were  
7 changed regularly to eliminate scent cues. The arenas were placed in the centre of a  
8 larger curtained area (280 cm by 380 cm) illuminated by banks of high frequency  
9 fluorescent lights concealed above a translucent plastic ceiling. The floor-to-ceiling  
10 curtains were white on three sides and were decorated with large black shapes on the  
11 fourth side (Fig. 1a). Ants followed a two-legged outward route from one end of the  
12 arena to a food site at the other end of the arena. The first leg of the route was along  
13 an open-topped narrow channel, 10 cm wide, bordered by 10 cm high solid white-  
14 finished walls. A black cylinder (47 cm high and 15 cm diameter) straddled the  
15 channel at the end of the first leg of the route. The channel prevented ants from seeing  
16 the overall position of the cylinder in the room until they had passed the cylinder. The  
17 second leg of the route extended from the channel exit across the open arena to the  
18 food site. A concealed tracking camera mounted in the ceiling recorded the paths of  
19 individual ants (Fry et al., 2000; Graham and Collett, 2002).

#### 21 *Experimental procedures*

22 In the first experiment we asked whether ants learn elements of homeward routes on  
23 their food-bound paths. Ants were not allowed to make their own way home from the  
24 food-site. Instead, they were carried from the food-site back to the nest, so limiting  
25 their visual experience to the outward route. To ensure that ants could not see the

1 cylinder or the room from the food site, the feeder - a microscope slide, on which was  
2 squirted a drop of sucrose solution, was placed at the bottom of an ant trap (8 cm  
3 diameter and 1.5 cm deep) that was set below floor level (Fig. 1a). The trap was  
4 surrounded by a 2 cm high black barrier with gaps through which the ants could pass.  
5 Ants dropped into the trap, fed on the sucrose, and remained in the trap until they  
6 were collected and returned to the nest. Some ants were trained with the channel and  
7 cylinder on the left of the direct food-bound path, on the same side as the patterned  
8 curtain, and some with the channel on the opposite side.

9

10 After about 20 outward trips, each ant was given the opportunity to perform a  
11 homeward route. To avoid any possible bias due to path integration, the ant did not  
12 make its own way to the feeder. It was taken from the nest and placed adjacent to a  
13 drop of sucrose on a microscope slide that was located at floor level in the usual  
14 position of the feeder. Ants were not disturbed by this unexpected procedure and  
15 mostly began feeding straight away. For this test, the channel was removed, the floor  
16 covered with fresh paper to eliminate guidance by chemical trails, and a second  
17 cylinder placed as shown in Figure 1b & c. This test was repeated after a further 7-10  
18 outward journeys.

19

20 The second experiment investigated the development of food-bound and homeward  
21 routes using the same arrangement of channel and cylinder, but in a slightly larger  
22 arena (200 cm by 124 cm). We recorded how routes developed in two groups of ants.  
23 In order to increase the number of successfully tracked food-bound runs, we attached  
24 a short narrow cardboard corridor to the end of the channel and started tracking when  
25 the ants emerged from the corridor. The first group performed both food-bound and

1 homeward routes, and we monitored the paths of individual ants over 30 to 40 round  
2 trips. For these ants, the feeder was at floor level with a small landmark close by.  
3 Ants in the second group did not make their own way home, and we just recorded  
4 each of their food-bound trips. After each ant had fed, it was carried back to the nest.  
5 The feeder for this group was put at the bottom of another slightly larger ant trap (10  
6 cm diameter and 3 cm deep) with a cylindrical landmark in its centre.

7

#### 8 *Route analysis*

9 To obtain some overall measure of how routes change with experience, we computed  
10 two global characteristics of each ant's path, first its straightness and second its  
11 consistency with respect to the preceding path of the same ant. In order to measure the  
12 straightness, the path was divided into 2s sections and the heading of each section  
13 calculated. The straightness of the trajectory is then given by the coherence of these  
14 headings (Batschelet, 1981). A value of one indicates a straight path and a value of  
15 zero indicates a path with no overall direction (e.g. a circle).

16

17 The consistency between pairs of consecutive trajectories was estimated by a  
18 procedure in which we first calculated the area enclosed by the two trajectories by  
19 counting the number of 1 cm grid squares that were enclosed by the paths or through  
20 which the paths passed. This value was then normalised by dividing it by the  
21 combined length of the paths. This procedure gives a minimum value of 0.5 when the  
22 paired trajectories are identical.

23



## 1   **Results**

### 2   *Return routes after food-bound training*

3   To find out whether ants had acquired information from food-bound trips that might  
4   help guide a homeward trip, we recorded each ants' behaviour after it had made about  
5   twenty food-bound trips and no homeward ones. The ant was taken singly from the  
6   nest, placed close to a drop of sucrose at the usual feeding site (see Methods), and its  
7   path tracked after it had finished feeding (Fig. 2A). After a further 7-10 training runs  
8   ants were tested a second time.

9  
10   The channel was absent in the tests and two identical cylinders were placed in the  
11   arena. One cylinder was in the training position and the other in a mirror symmetric  
12   position on the other side of the direct path between start and feeder (Fig. 1 & 2).  
13   Graham et al. (2003) showed that wood ants, during route learning, memorise both the  
14   appearance of a local landmark and the surroundings in which the landmark is set.  
15   They tend to ignore familiar looking landmarks placed in an inappropriate context.  
16   Therefore the extra landmark, whilst balancing out any innate attraction to a  
17   landmark, will not disrupt any manifestation of a learnt homeward route.

18  
19   There was no significant difference between the route characteristics of ants' first test  
20   runs and their seconds test runs (Sinuosity (mean  $\pm$  st. dev.), first runs:  $0.30 \pm 0.27$ ;  
21   second runs:  $0.27 \pm 0.24$ ;  $t(49) = ???$ ,  $p = 0.65$ ; Maximum distance reached, first runs:  
22    $63 \pm 30$ cm; second runs:  $61 \pm 28$ cm;  $t(49) = ???$ ,  $p = 0.76$ )

23  
24   Half of the ants were trained with the channel and cylinder to the left of the direct line  
25   from the start to the feeder, for the other half the channel and cylinder were to the

1 right of that line. The test trajectories for each of these training conditions are shown  
2 superimposed as separate density plots in Figure 1b & 1c. Both plots are biased  
3 significantly towards the side where the channel and landmark had been during  
4 outbound runs. The bias of an individual trajectory was assessed by calculating its  
5 mean position on the horizontal (x) axis - with the feeder at  $x=0$ . The return journeys  
6 of ants from both training conditions were biased significantly toward the position of  
7 the channel in training. Most (17/23; sign test,  $p=0.017$ ) trajectories from ants trained  
8 with the channel to the right of the direct line to the feeder were biased to the left  
9 (mean position  $<0$ ). Whereas most (21/28; sign test,  $p=0.006$ ) trajectories from ants  
10 trained with the channel to the left were biased to the right (mean position  $>0$ ).

11

12 The individual test trajectories are shown in Figure. 2a, with the paths of the right-  
13 trained ants mirrored to make them compatible with those of the left-trained ants. For  
14 clarity, a solid-circle marks the end-points of each recorded track. The end-positions  
15 are not behaviourally significant, as the tracks often stopped when the 6 min recording  
16 time was over, or before, if the tracking camera became locked onto the cylinder or  
17 the sidewall of the arena. Ants rarely took a direct path to the cylinder. Usually, they  
18 just moved somewhat erratically on the correct side but 'above' the channel exit, as  
19 they often did in early foraging trips when allowed to return home normally (Fig. 3).

20

### 21 *The development of food-bound and homeward routes*

22 The path of each ant between the end of the channel and the feeder was recorded  
23 individually for the first 30 to 40 successive foraging trips. Some ants performed both  
24 out and return journeys; other ants were only allowed to perform outward journeys  
25 and were carried home. The way that the paths change with experience is shown in

1 the different panels of Figure. 3. The food-bound paths are at first a little erratic, but  
2 straighten out rapidly, and there is little improvement in straightness from path 19  
3 onwards (Fig. 3). The food-bound routes of those ants that performed homeward  
4 routes did not differ quantitatively in straightness or consistency from those of ants  
5 that were carried home (Fig. 4).

6

7 The ants' homeward paths were considerably more variable at the start than were the  
8 food bound paths and it took more trials for the routes to stabilise. The first few  
9 returns were no more than roughly concentrated in the correct half of the arena. The  
10 paths slowly became more direct, but they did not form a tight cluster until returns 25  
11 to 30, even then the paths were curved. Only the final group of paths (returns 31-36)  
12 were straight.

13

14 It is not clear why homeward routes crystallise more slowly than food-bound routes.  
15 Some possibilities are: 1. The learning of homeward routes relies on path integration  
16 more than food-bound routes, and the necessary compass information to sustain path  
17 integration is missing in these laboratory experiments. 2. Segments of routes close to  
18 the goal may be learnt faster than more distant segments. In the present experiments,  
19 the monitored part of the route consists of the last segment of the food-bound route,  
20 but the first segment of the homeward route. 3. There is some asymmetry in what is  
21 acquired on outbound and homeward routes. Support for the third suggestion comes  
22 from studies on both bees and ants. Honeybees seem to learn local vectors on their  
23 outward but not on their homeward routes (Srinivasan et al., 1998), and data from a  
24 recent study on *Formica japonica* (Fukushi and Wehner, 2004) hints that outward  
25 routes may also be learnt better than homeward ones.

1

## 2 *Looking back along food-bound and homeward routes*

3 Ants on the food-bound or homeward leg of their foraging route could give  
4 themselves an opportunity of acquiring views for guiding travel in the reverse  
5 direction by turning around and then retracing their steps for a short segment. We  
6 scanned the recorded routes for reversals of this kind to discover when and where  
7 reversals occurred and how long they were. We looked for path segments in which the  
8 ants turned around and faced within  $\pm 20^\circ$  of the cylinder at the end of the channel  
9 on food-bound routes or within  $\pm 20^\circ$  of the feeder on homeward routes.

10

### 11 *Reversals on the food-bound path*

12 Occasionally, when ants were already some distance away from the channel exit, they  
13 reversed direction, returned to the channel exit and re-entered the channel. These ants  
14 usually remerged to walk to the feeder. Such complete loops occurred on about 25%  
15 of early runs. Loops became rarer as ants became experienced with the route. No  
16 loops occurred after run 12.

17

18 More frequently, ants turned back, retraced their path for a short segment and then  
19 continued with the food-bound segment. 27 out of 29 trained ants reversed direction at  
20 least once. These reversals were usually marked by the ant looping or making a U-  
21 bend (e.g., Fig. 5A). Most reversals were less than 3cm long (25<sup>th</sup>, 50<sup>th</sup> and 75<sup>th</sup>  
22 percentile of the distribution were 0.966, 2.450 and 8.387 cm respectively,  $n = 92$ ).  
23 Reversals occurred more often in early than in later runs (Fig. 5B) and were  
24 distributed evenly along the path (Fig. 5C). The occurrence of brief U-bends and  
25 loops on relatively straight segments is consistent with the suggestion that the

1 reversals are performed to acquire landmark information and that they are not just a  
2 by-product of the ant's erratic path on early trials.

#### 4 *Reversals on the homeward path*

5 On early runs ants often moved away from the feeder and then looped back after a  
6 short excursion. These loops could be in any direction and were not biased towards  
7 the exit to the channel. As reported earlier for learning flights in wasps (Zeil, 1993)  
8 and also for similar loops in wood ants (Nicholson et al., 1999), these loops often  
9 occur on the first runs of each day, even in well-trained ants (Fig. 5G).

11 Short reversals are also seen on paths that successfully reach the channel exit. The  
12 distribution of the length of reversals is single peaked with a tail that is shorter than  
13 reversals on the food bound trip (25<sup>th</sup>, 50<sup>th</sup> and 75<sup>th</sup> percentile of the distribution were  
14 0.775, 2.753 and 4.202 cm respectively, n =87. Reversals occur most frequently on  
15 early trials (Fig. 5E) Homeward reversals differ from the food-bound reversals in two  
16 major respects. First, all ants generated more reversals on their homeward than on  
17 their food bound paths, with a ratio of roughly two to one. Second, reversals are not  
18 evenly distributed along the route, but have a clear peak close to the food-site (Fig.  
19 5F). This peak suggests that the reversals may be more for learning the location of the  
20 site than the route to it.

#### 22 **Discussion**

23 Evidence is presented that wood ants learn some features of their homeward route on  
24 their way out to the feeder. Ants, which had made twenty or more trips to a feeder, but  
25 were always carried home after feeding, tended to move in a roughly homeward

1 direction when they were first allowed to move freely from the food site. These initial  
2 homeward paths were biased strongly to the predicted side, but they were not straight,  
3 and they were not aimed accurately at the start of the next route segment. The same  
4 imprecise and erratic behaviour was seen in the early homeward paths of ants learning  
5 foraging routes (Fig. 3).

6

7 What did ants acquire during their previous outbound trips that might guide their  
8 homeward segments? By testing ants after they were carried to the feeder, we  
9 eliminated the possibility that ants just reversed their immediately preceding food-  
10 bound trip, either using path integration or by reversing their compass direction. It  
11 also seems unlikely that the ants stored the overall compass direction of their habitual  
12 outbound trip and then after feeding reversed that direction on their first permitted  
13 homeward trip.

14

15 We suggest that in the tests ants guide their homeward path using views that include  
16 the rough location of the cylinder, which they have stored on earlier food-bound trips.  
17 Because ants cannot see the location of the cylinder from within the channel we  
18 suppose that the ants were guided by directional views acquired between the exit from  
19 the channel and the food site, and that these views were acquired when ants were  
20 facing roughly in the direction of the channel. The third section of the Results  
21 contains evidence that ants do reverse direction on this segment of their outward trip,  
22 particularly when they are inexperienced.

23

24 While, as outlined in the Introduction, there is clear evidence that bees and wasps  
25 acquire information to guide their return to a goal when leaving it, the conclusion

1 from one study to examine when homeward route information is acquired (Bisch-  
2 Knaden and Wehner, 2003) concluded that the desert ant, *Cataglyphis fortis*, learns  
3 homeward local vectors (Collett et al., 1998) only on the homeward journey and not  
4 on the food-ward journey. Ants, in this study, experienced an array of landmarks close  
5 to the feeder either when they approached the feeder from the nest or only when they  
6 left the feeder to return to the nest. To accomplish this separation, ants were caught at  
7 the feeder and carried to a distant site where they performed a homeward trip driven  
8 by their path integration home vector. They were caught and returned to the nest when  
9 they began to search at the end of their home vector. Each ant was trained over 5  
10 round trips of this kind before it was tested. For testing, the ant was caught at the end  
11 of the home vector and replaced at the departure point. This manipulation ensured that  
12 the ants had no global vector and would only move in a defined direction if a response  
13 were to be triggered by the landmarks. Ants accustomed to viewing landmarks on  
14 their way home exhibited a home vector by travelling a few metres in the direction of  
15 their nest. Ants accustomed to landmarks on the way to the feeder searched around the  
16 release point in an undirected fashion, as did ants trained either with no landmarks or  
17 with landmarks on both routes and then tested with no landmarks.

18  
19  
20 The methodologies of the *Cataglyphis* and *Formica* experiments differ in the sense  
21 that the wood ants had no experience of a homeward route before testing, whereas the  
22 desert ants were trained without landmarks on their homeward route and so could  
23 have learnt associations that competed with any reaction to the test landmarks  
24 acquired on the food-ward trip. The barren terrain makes interference of this kind  
25 unlikely, and the more plausible account is that given by Bisch-Knaden and Wehner

(2003) that landmark induced local vectors are only learnt in the context in which they are used. In contrast, the current wood ant data suggest that visual cues to guide the homeward trip may be acquired when ants are in a food-ward motivated state.

If ants travelling their food-bound route acquire views for guiding both their food-bound route and their homeward route, how do they know which of the two sets of stored views they should apply on the way home. Ants must in some manner label memories as being appropriate either for the way out or for the way home. Wood ants, which are familiar with a visually guided route, prime visual memories for their food-ward or homeward trip according to whether they are unfed or have fed (Harris et al., 2005). Similarly, a homeward bound *Melophorus* ignores its food-ward route if placed on it, but will immediately join its homeward route (Wehner et al. in press). The current data suggest that a wood ant on acquiring a view on the way to a food site tags the view as foodward or homeward according to whether the view is acquired when the ant is facing in the direction of food or home.

One worrying characteristic of our data is that it took many trials for the homeward route to straighten. This slow development of the route may result from the absence of sky compass information within the laboratory. Repetition of the experiment out of doors, where the ant's sky compass could operate normally, might both speed up route acquisition and also make it easier for an ant to determine whether a view acquired on the food-ward route should be pigeonholed as information for guiding future food-ward or homeward trips.



- 1       **Andel, D. M. and Wehner, R.** (2003). Path integration in desert ants,  
2 Cataglyphis: redirecting global vectors. In *Proceedings of the 29th Göttingen*  
3 *Neurobiology Conference 2003*, (ed. N. Elsner). Stuttgart: Thieme Verlag.
- 4       **Batschelet, E.** (1981). Circular Statistics in Biology. London: Academic  
5 Press.
- 6       **Bisch-Knaden, S. and Wehner, R.** (2003). Local vectors in desert ants:  
7 context-dependent landmark learning during outbound and homebound runs. *Journal*  
8 *of Comparative Physiology a-Neuroethology Sensory Neural and Behavioral*  
9 *Physiology* **189**, 181-187.
- 10       **Collett, M., Collett, T. S., Bisch, S. and Wehner, R.** (1998). Local and  
11 global vectors in desert ant navigation. *Nature* **394**, 269-272.
- 12       **Collett, T., Dillmann, E., Giger, A. and Wehner, R.** (1992a). Visual  
13 landmarks and route following in desert ants. *J. Comp. Physiol. A.* **170**, 435-442.
- 14       **Collett, T. S., Collett, M. and Wehner, R.** (2001). The guidance of desert  
15 ants by extended landmarks. *Journal of Experimental Biology* **204**, 1635-1639.
- 16       **Collett, T. S., Dillmann, E., Giger, A. and Wehner, R.** (1992b). Visual  
17 Landmarks and Route Following in Desert Ants. *Journal of Comparative Physiology*  
18 *a-Sensory Neural and Behavioral Physiology* **170**, 435-442.
- 19       **Collett, T. S. and Lehrer, M.** (1993). Looking and Learning - a Spatial  
20 Pattern in the Orientation Flight of the Wasp *Vespula-Vulgaris*. *Proceedings of the*  
21 *Royal Society of London Series B-Biological Sciences* **252**, 129-134.
- 22       **Fry, S. N., Bichsel, M., Muller, P. and Robert, D.** (2000). Tracking of flying  
23 insects using pan-tilt cameras. *J. Neurosci. Meth.* **101**, 59-67.
- 24       **Fukushi, T. and Wehner, R.** (2004). Navigation in wood ants *Formica*  
25 *japonica*: context dependent use of landmarks. *Journal of Experimental Biology* **207**,  
26 3431-3439.
- 27       **Graham, P. and Collett, T. S.** (2002). View-based navigation in insects: how  
28 wood ants (*Formica rufa* L.) look at and are guided by extended landmarks. *Journal of*  
29 *Experimental Biology* **205**, 2499-2509.
- 30       **Graham, P., Fauria, K. and Collett, T. S.** (2003). The influence of beacon-  
31 aiming on the routes of wood ants. *Journal of Experimental Biology* **206**, 535-541.
- 32       **Harris, R. A., de Ibarra, N. H., Graham, P. and Collett, T. S.** (2005). Ant  
33 navigation - Priming of visual route memories. *Nature* **438**, 302-302.
- 34       **Kohler, M. and Wehner, R.** (2005). Idiosyncratic route-based memories in  
35 desert ants, *Melophorus bagoti*: How do they interact with path-integration vectors?  
36 *Neurobiology of Learning and Memory* **83**, 1-12.
- 37       **Lehrer, M.** (1993). Why Do Bees Turn Back and Look. *Journal of*  
38 *Comparative Physiology a-Sensory Neural and Behavioral Physiology* **172**, 549-563.
- 39       **Macquart, D., Garnier, L., Combe, M. and Beugnon, G.** (2005). Ant  
40 navigation *en route* to the goal: signature routes facilitate way-finding of *Gigantiops*  
41 *destructor*. *J. Comp. Physiol. A.*
- 42       **Nicholson, D. J., Judd, S. P. D., Cartwright, B. A. and Collett, T. S.** (1999).  
43 Learning walks and landmark guidance in wood ants (*Formica rufa*). *Journal of*  
44 *Experimental Biology* **202**, 1831-1838.
- 45       **Rosengren, R.** (1971). Route fidelity, visual memory and recruitment  
46 behaviour in foraging wood ants of genus *Formica* (Hymenopterus, Formicidae). *Acta*  
47 *Zool. Fenn.* **133**, 1-106.
- 48       **Santschi, F.** (1913). Comment s'orientent les fourmis. *Rev. Suisse. Zool.* **21**,  
49 347-425.

- 1       **Srinivasan, M. V., Zhang, S. W. and Lehrer, M.** (1998). Honeybee  
2 navigation: odometry with monocular input. *Animal Behaviour* **56**, 1245-1259.
- 3       **Tinbergen, N.** (1932). Über die orientierung des Bienenwolfes (*Philanthus*  
4 *triangulum* Fabr.). *Z. vergl. Physiol.* **16**, 305-335.
- 5       **von Frisch, K.** (1967). The Dance Language and orientation of Bees. London:  
6 Oxford University Press.
- 7       **Wagner, W.** (1907). Psycho-biologische Untersuchungen an Hummeln.  
8 Stuttgart: Schweizerbartsche Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- 9       **Wehner, R., Harkness, R. D. and Schmid-Hempel, P.** (1983). Foraging  
10 strategies in individually searching ants, *Cataglyphis bicolor* (Hymenoptera,  
11 Formicidae). In *Information processing in animals*, (ed. M. Lindauer), pp. 1-79.  
12 Stuttgart: Fischer.
- 13       **Wehner, R., Meier, C. and Zollikofer, C.** (2004). The ontogeny of foraging  
14 behaviour in desert ants, *Cataglyphis bicolor*. *Ecological Entomology* **29**, 240-250.
- 15       **Wehner, R., Michel, B. and Antonsen, P.** (1996). Visual navigation in  
16 insects: Coupling of egocentric and geocentric information. *J. Exp. Biol.* **199**, 129-  
17 140.
- 18       **Zeil, J.** (1993). Orientation Flights of Solitary Wasps (*Cerceris*, Sphecidae,  
19 Hymenoptera) .1. Description of Flight. *Journal of Comparative Physiology a-*  
20 *Sensory Neural and Behavioral Physiology* **172**, 189-205.
- 21

1    Figure 1. **The experimental arena. A, C:** Experimental arena and training layout.  
2    Ants travelled along an open topped, narrow channel and under a large cylinder  
3    before heading over an open arena to the feeder. The feeder was at the bottom of a  
4    small pit (shown enlarged in **A**) and for the first experiment, a small barrier was  
5    placed around the pit to prevent the ants from viewing the landmark and its  
6    surroundings from the pit. In tests ants were taken directly from the nest and placed  
7    on a feeder (indicated by **F**). Two landmarks were positioned symmetrically in the  
8    arena. **B, D:** Cumulative density distributions of all return trajectories from ants  
9    trained with the channel to left or right respectively. Dark areas represent areas where  
10    ants spent the most time. Values are given as proportion of the total time spent in the  
11    arena. Because of the large amount of time spent at or near the feeder, all values  
12    above 2.5% are represented as black squares.

13  
14    Figure 2. **The ants' first and second trips home after many food-bound runs. A:**  
15    Trajectories of ants after leaving the feeder. Trajectories ended after 6 min or before if  
16    the camera 'lost' the ant. Trajectories are shown from when the ant has reached at  
17    least 10cm from the feeder and end points are marked by small black circles.  
18    Trajectories from ants trained with the channel on the right hand side of the direct  
19    route to the food have been mirrored to correspond with the training arrangement  
20    shown in Figure 1A. **B, C, D:** Circumferential positions of ants at 20cm, 40cm and  
21    60cm from the feeder. Grey lines represent the direct trajectory to the normal position  
22    of the cylinder. Arrow and range represent the mean heading and 95% confidence  
23    interval.

1 Figure 3. **How trajectories change with experience.** Trajectories are shown grouped  
2 by run number. Ants are only included if they had performed at least 10 routes. The  
3 end of the channel and the food are at (0,0) and (50,50) respectively. Low barriers that  
4 were used to constrain ants within the half of the arena containing the feeder  
5 influenced the paths on initial runs. **A:** Food-bound trajectories of ants (N=14) that  
6 were carried back to the nest after feeding with out performing homeward trajectories.  
7 **B,C:** The food-bound and homeward trajectories, respectively, of ants that performed  
8 round trips (N=12).

10 Figure 4. **Improvements in the straightness and consistency of trajectories.**  
11 **A,B,C:** Measure of the straightness of food bound and homeward trajectories plotted  
12 against run number. A: ants that only performed food-bound routes. B and C, ants that  
13 performed both food-bound and homeward routes. **D,E,F:** Consistency of trajectories  
14 plotted against run number for ants grouped as in A to C. Thin lines plot the  
15 straightness or consistency of individual ants. The thick black line and the grey area  
16 show the overall mean and the 95% confidence interval respectively. To assess the  
17 statistical significance of any changes, runs were grouped into three successive blocks  
18 of 10, and the mean straightness and consistency of the runs were computed for each  
19 individual over each block. Both straightness (repeated measures ANOVA;  $F =$   
20  $39.662$ ,  $DF_2, 48$ ,  $p < 0.005$ ) and consistency (repeated measures ANOVA;  $F =$   
21  $10.152$ ,  $DF_2, 46$ ,  $p < 0.005$ ) improved with experience. The types of route differed  
22 significantly in their straightness (One-way ANOVA,  $F = 28.825$ ,  $DF\ 2, 24$ ,  $P <$   
23  $0.005$ ), but not in their consistency (One-way ANOVA,  $F = 1.223$ ,  $DF\ 2, 23$ ,  $P =$   
24  $0.313$ ). The two types of food-bound paths were significantly straighter than  
25 homeward paths, but were not significantly different from each other.

1

2 **Figure 5. Temporal and spatial distribution of reversals on food-bound and**  
3 **homeward routes. A, D:** Examples of reversals on food-bound (A) and homeward  
4 (D) routes. **B, E:** The proportion of ants whose food-bound (B) and homeward (E)  
5 trajectories contain reversals is plotted against run number. **C, F:** The distribution of  
6 reversals along the food-bound (C) and homeward (F) paths is shown relative to the  
7 end of the channel. **G:** Closed loops from the feeder. The mean number of loops per  
8 trajectory is plotted against run number over three successive days. Loops are defined  
9 as round trips from and back to the feeder in which the ant travels at least 5 cm from  
10 the feeder. Data come from 12 ants performing a total of 259 homeward trajectories.  
11 The length of each X-axis indicates the maximum number of training runs on that day.

12

Figure 1




Figure 2




Figure 3







Figure 4



# Figure 5

